

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have received and reviewed the Office Action dated May 12, 2011. Applicants request entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the rejection of the claims.

Claims 1,2, 6, 17, and 43 have been amended. Claims 1, 2, 6, and 17 have been amended to remove parenthesis around the SEQ ID NOs. Claim 43 has been amended to change dependency.

Claims 46-48 are new . The new claims are supported throughout the specification including at page 36, line 34 to page 37, line 4; and page 79, line 34 to page 80, line 21. The new claims correspond to claims 34, 36, and 37 of US Ser. No, 08/425,016.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Spector for the interview conducted on October 20, 2011. We discussed the status of the claims.

### **Double Patenting**

Claims 1, 6 and 38-43 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 6-8, 13-15 and 36 of US Application No. 08/223,263.

Claims 2, 6 and 17 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 6-8, 13-15 and 36 of US Application No. 08/223,263, in view of Curtis et al., US 5,073,627 and Lin, US 5,441,868.

Claims 1, 6 and 38-43 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 7, 13-15 and 36 of US Application No. 08/374,540.

Claims 2, 6 and 17 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 6-8, 13-15 and 36 of US Application No. 08/374,540 in view of Curtis et al. and Lin.

Claims 1, 6 and 38-43 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 28 and 32-42 of US

Application No. 08/422,194. US Application No. 08/422,194 has been expressly abandoned rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 2, 6 and 17 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 28 and 32-42 of US Application No. 08/422,194 in view of Curtis et al. and Lin. US Application No. 08/422,194 has been expressly abandoned rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 17 and 38-45 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 12-14, 34, 36 and 37 of US Application No. 08/425,016. US Application No. 08/425,016 has been expressly abandoned rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 17 and 38-45 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 34, 38-40 and 44-46 of US Application No. 08/425,095. US Application No. 08/425,095 has been expressly abandoned rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 38-43 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, 4 and 24 of US Application No. 08/429,365.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 17 and 38-45 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 24 and 28-31 of US Application No. 08/430,018.

Claims 2, 6, 17, 41, 42 and 43 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 16-18 and 41-48 of US Application No. 08/433,098 in view of Royer, US 4,002,531 and Shadle et al., US 4,847,325.

In response, Applicants are submitting herewith a Terminal Disclaimer for each of the pending above-identified applications in order to obviate these rejections. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

Reply to Office Action of May 12, 2011

**Summary**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.


Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for a sufficient number of months to enter these papers or any future reply, if appropriate.

Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: November 11, 2011

  
Katherine M. Kowalchyk  
Reg. No. 36,848

KMK:kf

